REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed September 14, 2009. Before this Amendment, claims 1-42, 44-48, and 50-68 were pending. In this Amendment, claims 1, 7-8, 14, 20, 25, 32, 36-37, 42, 44, 57, 62, 65 and 68 have been amended, no claims are canceled, and no new claims are presented for consideration. After entry of this Amendment, which is respectfully requested, claims 1-42, 44-48, and 50-68 will still be pending.

I.   CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected all the pending claims (claims 1-42, 44-48, and 50-68) as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lee (US 2002/0129024) (hereinafter "Lee") in view of Chung et al. (US 6,850,947) (hereinafter "Chung"). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be a teaching or suggestion to combine the references or it must be shown that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to try the combination. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because the cited references fail to teach or suggest a motivation to combine the references, it would not have been obvious to combine the references as proposed in the Office Action, and that combining the references would not produce the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 as amended recites in part:

> select a first compound transform definition from the one or more transform process definitions, the selected first compound transform definition including a hierarchical data structure with a first sub-definition,
> invoke a first parallel processing thread to process the first compound transform definition including the first sub-definition,
> select a second compound transform definition from the one or more transform process definitions, the selected second compound transform definition including a hierarchical data structure with a second sub-definition,
> invoke a second parallel processing thread to process the second compound transform definition including the second sub-definition,
> **concurrently navigate the selected first compound transform definition, the selected second compound transform definition, and the data to be transformed using the parallel processing threads**, navigation within the

>   data to be transformed being responsive to transform definitions within the
>   selected first and second transform definitions, and
>   **generate an output data file** having a data structure responsive to
>   a data structure of the selected first and second compound transform definitions.

(emphasis added). Independent claims 7, 14, 20, 32, 44, 57, 59, 62, and 65 have been amended

similarly. Support for the amendments is in the original application, for example in FIGS. 5A-

5D.

            As acknowledged by the Examiner, Lee fails to disclose concurrently navigating

the selected first compound transform definition, the selected second compound transform

definition, and the data to be transformed using the parallel processing threads, navigation within

the data to be transformed being responsive to transform definitions within the selected first and

second transform definitions (Office Action p. 4).

            Chung col. 7, lines 15-22 and lines 52-66, is cited by the Office Action for

teaching the above limitations, and the Office Action concludes that one would have been

motivated to combine the references so that "data contention is reduced and throughput is

increased" (Chung col. 7, lines 21-22). Applicants respectfully disagree.

            Chung's parallel processing of data from its source database to create multiple

"data marts" is incompatible with Lee. Chung teaches that data from a data source is partitioned

into "non-overlapping sets of data" from which multiple pipelines can process data (see Chung

col. 3, lines 10-11). The pipelines are constructed "so as to minimize data sharing. That is,

many pipelines are used, with parallel pipelines performing identical or different processes such

that a maximum number of pipelines do not share data at all with other pipelines" (Chung col. 6,

lines 20-25). The pipelines then transform the data and store it in a target database or in separate

data marts (see Chung FIGS. 5 and 3). Chung's multiple pipeline transformations process data

to end up with separate and distinct data aggregations, such as the total purchase price for a line

item in an order or the total number and average salary of all employees in a particular office

(Chung col. 7, lines 23-39). Chung's partitioning and then pipelined transformation *split* the data

into different entities without regard to recombining the data into a single file and thus do not

teach or suggest "generat[ing] **an** output data file having a data structure responsive to a data

structure of the selected first and second compound transform definitions" (emphasis added) as claimed with the above limitations.

It simply would not have made sense to one skilled in the art to combine the two references because Chung's data, which can be easily partitioned as indicated by Chung's teaching that a user can "manually arrange[] the selected transformation components to form parallel pipelines," is fundamentally different than Lee's XML data. There is no indication in either reference how to use Chung's parallel processing with the data of Lee.

Naturally, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference, Lee or Chung, to combine the references as indicated by the Office Action. Because it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention for the references to be combined, and even if they were combined they would not end up with the invention as claimed, the references cannot render the claims unpatentable under § 103. For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and all claims depending therefrom.

II.   AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Unless otherwise specified or addressed in the remarks section, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

OID-2005-309-01

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Mathison
Reg. No. 57,556

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MPM:cta
62358014 v1